REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 12, 21, 32, 43, 54 and 65 are amended. Claims 1-65 remain pending in the application. The amendments to the claims, specification and drawings as indicated herein do not add any new matter to this application. Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed March 29, 2007 is addressed hereinafter.

I.   ISSUES NOT RELATING TO PRIOR ART

    A.   DRAWING FIG. 1B, FIG. 4, FIG. 5

A substitute sheet for FIG. 1B is filed concurrently herewith. In the substitute sheet, the reference numeral for the Configuration Server is changed to "122" to remove a duplicate reference numeral.

A substitute sheet for FIG. 4 is filed concurrently herewith. In the substitute sheet, the reference numeral for the Generic Configuration Template is changed to "124" to remove a duplicate reference numeral.

A substitute sheet for FIG. 5 is filed concurrently herewith. The substitute sheet conforms FIG. 5 to the specification as filed. No new matter is introduced.

II.   ISSUES RELATING TO PRIOR ART

    A.   CLAIMS 1, 12, 21, 32, 43, 54 AND 65

Claims 1-65 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by US patent 7,150,037 to Wolf et al.

Present Claims 1, 12, 21, 32, 43, 54 and 65 recite:

generating a _local_ user interface (Claims 1, 12, 21, 32, 43, 54 and 65); support basis for the _local_ user interface is found in Applicant's specification at paragraph 0049 and FIG. 4 (Subscriber 140 and User 142 shown within one common block and separate from the Network 105.); and,

wherein the partial configuration is at least partially customized with one or more configuration parameter values specific to a network service provider prior to shipment of the network device to a user. (Claims 1, 21, 32, 43);

wherein the configuration template is at least partially customized with one or more configuration parameter values specific to a network service provider. (Claim 12); and,

wherein the partial configuration is at least partially customized with one or more configuration parameter values specific to the network service provider before providing the device to the end user. (Claim 53, 65)

Support for the "*wherein*" clauses is found in Applicant's specification in several places, most notably at paragraphs 0024, 0043, 0076 and 0082.

Local User Interface

The user interface of Wolf et al. shown in FIG. 8 and in col. 8, line 57 and col. 9, line 15, cited in the Office Action, describes a hierarchical set of target devices retrieved from an asset database (col. 3, lines 20-23; col. 6, lines 42-45; col. 9, lines 40-43) for *remotely* updating or changing configuration settings, etc. As such, the user interface as taught or otherwise suggested by Wolf is not a <u>local</u> user interface connected to the network device to be updated or changed by the user. In fact, the user interface of Wolf is not locally connected to any network device, but is part of the overall network management system shown in FIG. 9.

Moreover, Wolf et al. specifically teaches away from local administration of network devices in several places as follows:

"With traditional manual-configuration practices, the sheer volume of configuration work requires the participation of many different ISP operations personnel." (col. 2, lines 24-26)

"Operations departments often need to make routine updates to many devices at one time. This manual procedure is time-consuming, tedious and error prone." (col. 3, lines 64-66)

"Current manual-device configuration practices are reaching the end of their useful life. Without an automated configuration solution, ISPs will face increasing delays and obstacles in

the deployment of new services. In a worse case scenario, manual-configuration practices can make service on the Internet so unpredictable that its value to society will decline." (col. 4, lines 36-42.)

Thus, Wolf et al. specifically teaches away from using a local user interface as provided in present Claims 1, 12, 21, 32, 43, 54 and 65.

Pre-Configuring Network Devices

The management system of Wolf et al. addresses managing a multitude of *existing* network devices having many different configuration settings, manufacturers, native file formats and access controls which are *already deployed* in large scale network infrastructures as is provided under the discussion for FIGS.1 and 2 (col. 5, lines 55-67; col.6, lines 1-19.)

Applicant's solution is directed toward minimizing the installation complexity of network devices *prior* to installation by allowing network service providers to at least partially pre-configure (i.e., customize) the network devices *prior to distribution* and allowing the receiving users to locally complete the device's configurations once connected to the service provider's network (paragraphs 0040-0044.)

Since Wolf et al. is only concerned with *already deployed* networking devices, it is not surprising that Wolf et al. is completely silent as to pre-configuring a networking device with a service provider's *custom* configuration parameters *before* distributing the network device to a user as is provided in the "wherein" clause included in Claims 1, 12, 21, 32, 43, 54 and 65. (Claim 12 already included the feature "*prior to movement of the network device from a vendor or service provider to a user.*")

Accordingly, Wolf et al. does not teach or otherwise suggest customizing one or more configuration parameter values specific to a network service provider prior to shipment of the network device to a user as is provided in Claims 1, 12, 21, 32, 43, 54, 65. Further, Claims 1, 12, 21, 32, 43, 54, 65 as herein amended recites one or more limitations that are not taught or

suggested by Wolf et al. and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of Claims 1, 12, 21, 32, 43, 54, 65.

      B.   CLAIMS 2-11, 13-20, 22-31, 33-42, 44-53, AND 55-64

In light of the amendments to independent Claims 1, 12, 21, 32, 43, 54, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of dependent claims 2-11, 13-20, 22-31, 33-42, 44-53, 55-64 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Claims 2-11, 13-20, 22-31, 33-42, 44-53, 55-64 depend from their respective independent Claims 1, 12, 21, 32, 43, 54 and include each and every feature of the independent claims. The independent Claims 1, 12, 21, 32, 43, 54 are patentable over Wolf for the reasons given above. Therefore, dependent Claims 2-11, 13-20, 22-31, 33-42, 44-53 and 55-64 are also patentable over Wolf. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of Claims 2-11, 13-20, 22-31, 33-42, 44-53 and 55-64.

III.   CONCLUSIONS & MISCELLANEOUS

Applicant has considered Wolf et al. in its entirety as well as the context of the passages cited in the Office Action. For the reasons set forth above, all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

No extension fee is believed to be due. However, to the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee that may be due in relation to this application to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Please contact the undersigned by telephone relating to any issue that would advance

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

Attorney Docket No.: 50325-0782

examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

/ChristopherJPalermo#42056/
Christopher J. Palermo, Reg. No. 42,056

Dated: June 21, 2007

2055 Gateway Place Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110
Tel: (408) 414-1080x202
Fax: (408) 414-1076

Attorney Docket No.: 50325-0782